

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Having amended claims 67, 69-70, 76 and 78-79 and cancelled claim 68, claims 67 and 69-82 are currently pending in the present application. Applicants believe no new matter has been added by the amendments.

REMARKS

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

In the Office Action dated December 2, 2004 (the "Office Action"), the Examiner rejected claim 67 because the phrase "pre-selected portions" is allegedly indefinite. Amended claim 67 does not recite that phrase. The Examiner also rejected claims 79, 81, and 82 as providing insufficient antecedent bases. Claim 79 has been amended to provide the required antecedent bases. Hence, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claim 67 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. P. No. 6,389,475 issued to Speakman et al. (the "Speakman patent") in view of U.S.P. No. 5,835,922 issued to Shima et al. (the "Shima patent"). The Examiner also rejected claims 68-82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Speakman patent in view of the Shima patent and U.S.P. No. 5,200,028 issued to Tatsumi (the "Tatsumi patent").

III. Interview Summary and Response to the Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner is thanked for granting and cordially conducting an in-person interview on May 4, 2005. Specifically, and in accordance with 37 CFR Section 133:

- Claims 67, 68, and 74 in view of the references cited by the Examiner were discussed.
- Though no official agreement was reached, the Examiner did suggest that, to overcome the cited art, the claims should be amended to include “structure related to microelectronic manufacturing devices.”

Accordingly, amended claim 67 now recites that the claimed “publisher client” is “configured to operate with one or more of the assembly line devices,” which are microelectronic manufacturing devices. This and other claimed features of the present application are not taught or suggested in the cited prior art.

In particular, the Speakman patent does not teach or suggest a publisher configured to operate with assembly line devices. The Shima patent describes a document retrieval system for automatically creating documents. It does not teach or suggest a publisher configured to operate with assembly line devices. As for the Tatsumi patent, it mainly describes semiconductor-manufacturing devices to be used as stand-alone devices. It does not teach or suggest a publisher configured to operate with assembly line devices.

Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited prior art because the Speakman, Shima and Tatsumi patents, individually or combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention of the present application.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objections and rejections and to examine the pending claims favorably.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to deposit account no. 08-0219. In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to deposit account no. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP



Anthony H. Kahng
Registration No. 42,704

1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202.942.8477
Fax: 202.942.8484
Date: July 13, 2005
AHK:cj